



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/661,926

09/11/2003

Mazen Chmaytelli

990545

8382

23696 7590 09/22/2011  
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED  
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

HALIYUR, VENKATESH N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2476

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/22/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/661,926 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>CHMAYTELLI ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>VENKATESH HALIYUR | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2476                  |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35(claims 20,30 canceled) is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19,21-29 and 31-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The amendment filed on 07/12/2011 has been fully considered. Rejection follows.
2. Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 20, 30 are canceled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-19, 21-29, 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. [US Pub: 2003/0112952] and Helferich [US Pat: 6,696,921] further in view of Mizikovsky et al. [US Pat: 5,559,860].

Regarding claims 1, 32, Brown disclosed a cellular telephone (**items 502, 504, Figs 5/6, para 0152-0153, 0168-169**) comprising: a processor (**item 530 of Fig 5**); a wireless communication interface (**item 528 of Fig 5**), coupled to said processor, wherein the wireless communication interface selectively receives an

attempted incoming communication connection across a wireless network (**filter or screen calls, para 0094**); and a memory coupled to said processor (**para 0018, 0045-0047**), wherein the processor is configured to: receive an attempted incoming communication connection (**para 0033-0037, Fig 1**); determine whether the attempted incoming communication can be classified based on whether identifying information of the attempted incoming communication connection is recognized (**item 524 of Fig 5, para 0091**) and determine whether there is a default response associated with exists when it is determined that the unclassified incoming communications when identifying information is not recognized (**caller identification, para 0027-0028, 0083, 0090**) and request a user to input a classification for the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when the identifying information is not recognized and it is determined that no default response is associated with unclassified incoming communications exists (**classify the attempted calls according to calling party classification, para 0029, 0091-0094**);

Brown disclosed that PDA, wireless telephone (**cellular telephone**) may comprise call processor (**item 120b of Fig 1, para 0047**) and the classification process in the cellular telephone (**0057-0063**) but fails to explicitly disclose that the processor is located at a cellular telephone and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the

identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications.

However, Helferich disclosed a mobile device including the wireless communication interface coupled to a processor, and the memory coupled to the processor module for performing processing tasks (**Fig 1-2**) to provide predetermined responses based on the incoming service request (**col 3, lines 37-48, col 4, lines 55-67, col 5, lines 1-67, col 6, lines 1-7**) and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications (**col 7, lines 32-65, col 11, lines 54-67, col 12, lines 1-37, Fig 9**)

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of including a processor coupled to the memory and the client module for performing processing tasks in the cellular telephone and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications as taught by Helferich et al in the system of Brown et al to include a processor coupled to a memory and a classifier in the cellular telephone to classify the incoming communication connection and wherein the

default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications.

Both Brown and Helferich fail to positively disclose classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized and determine whether there is a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification, wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication and allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication.

Mizikovsky disclosed a method for classifying the attempted incoming communication connection using the identifying information with default responses (**item 310 of Fig 3, item 108 of Fig 2, col 4, lines 22-64, function category, response categories set by the user, col 6, lines 44-67**) and classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized (**col 7, lines 50-62, Fig**

1) and determine whether there is a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification (**col 7, lines 63-67**), wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication (**col 7, lines 32-38**) and allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection (**col 7, lines 39-67**) or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication (**col 8, lines 14-19, Fig 5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of whether to classify or not to classify the incoming connection based on the identifying information in the connection request as taught by Mizikovsky et al in the system of Brown et al as modified by Helferich et al to include the features of whether to classify or use default classification if exists based on the identifying information or classify according to user's classification if a default classification does not exist and to provide a predetermined response to the attempted incoming connection request. One is motivated as such in order to provide a predetermined response to improve the call handling ability based on the classification and identification of the incoming call at a cellular telephone.

Regarding claims 2-3,12-13,22-23, Brown et al disclosed that the predetermined response comprises blocking **(filter or screen calls)** the attempted incoming communication connection attempt and the predetermined response comprises sending an audio response **(voice message/mail)** to the attempted incoming communication connection **(para 0094)**.

Regarding claim 4, 14, 24, Brown et al disclosed that the predetermined response comprises requesting user input as to whether to accept the attempted incoming communication connection **(para 0032-0033, 0039-0042)**.

Regarding claim 5, 15, 25, Brown et al disclosed that the predetermined response comprises returning a data response to the attempted incoming communication connection **(para 0124)**.

Regarding claim 6, 16, 26, Brown et al disclosed that the classification of the attempted incoming communication connection occurs from identifying the telephone number of a calling telephone making the attempted incoming communication connection **(para 0037)**.

Regarding claims 7-8, 17-18, 27-28, Brown et al disclosed wherein identifying a telephone number of a calling telephone comprises receiving Caller ID for the attempted incoming communication connection and the classifying the attempted incoming communications occurs through the receipt of identity data within the attempted incoming communication connection **(para 0091-0093)**.

Regarding claim 9, 19, 29, Brown et al disclosed wherein returning a data response to the attempted incoming communication connection comprises



sending a short messaging service (**SMS**) message to a device making the attempted incoming communication connection (**para 0124**).

Regarding claims 10, 33 Brown et al disclosed a computer cellular telephone (**items 502, 504, Fig 5, para 0152**) comprising:

means for selectively receiving (**filter or screen calls**) an attempted incoming communication connection across a wireless network (**Figs 1**);  
means for determining whether the attempted incoming communication (**item 524 of Fig 5**) can be classified based on whether identifying information of the attempted incoming communication connection is recognized (**para 0091**);  
means for determining whether there is a default response associated with exists when it is determined that the unclassified incoming communications when the identifying information is not recognized (**caller identification, para 0083, 0090**), wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection (**para 0168**); means for requesting a user to classify the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when the identifying information is not recognized and it is determined that no default response is associated with unclassified incoming communications\_(**col 4, lines 22-64**);  
means for classifying the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized a classification by the user, then it is determined that the user classified the

incoming communication **(classify the attempted calls according to calling party classification, para 0091-0094, 0170);**

Brown et al fails to explicitly disclose means for wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications.

However, Helferich disclosed means for wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications **(col 7, lines 32-65, col 11, lines 54-67, col 12, lines 1-37, Fig 9)**

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of including a processor coupled to the memory and the client module for performing processing tasks in the cellular telephone and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications as taught by Helferich et al in the system of Brown et

al to include a processor coupled to a memory and a classifier in the cellular telephone to classify the incoming communication connection.

Both Brown and Helferich fail to positively disclose means for classifying the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized and means for determining whether there is a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification, wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and means for performing the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication and means for allowing connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication.

Mizikovsky disclosed means for classifying the attempted incoming communication connection using the identifying information with default responses (**item 310 of Fig 3, item 108 of Fig 2, col 4, lines 22-64, function category, response categories set by the user, col 6, lines 44-67**) and classifying the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized (**col 7, lines 50-62, Fig 1**) and determining whether there is a predetermined response to the

attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification (**col 7, lines 63-67**), wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and performing the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication (**col 7, lines 32-38**) and allowing the connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection (**col 7, lines 39-67**) or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication (**col 8, lines 14-19, Fig 5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the means for classifying, determining, performing and allowing functions to classify the incoming connection with default responses for the unclassified connection requests based on the identifying information in the attempted connection request as taught by Mizikovsky et al in the system of Brown et al as modified by Helferich et al to include the means to means for classifying, determining, performing and allowing functions to classify the incoming connection with default responses for the unclassified connection requests based on the identifying information in the connection. One is motivated as such in order to provide a predetermined response to improve the call handling ability based on the classification and identification of the incoming call at a cellular telephone.

Regarding claims 11, 34 Brown et al disclosed a method for responding to incoming communication connection attempts at a cellular telephone (**items 502, 504, para 0152**), comprising:

receiving an attempted incoming communication connection at the cellular telephone (**para 0017-0018**); storing the attempted incoming communication in a memory of the cellular telephone (**para 0047,0152-0153**); determine whether the attempted incoming communication can be classified based on whether identifying information of the attempted incoming communication connection is recognized (**item 524 of Fig 5, para 0091**) and determine whether there is a default response associated with exists when it is determined that the unclassified incoming communications when identifying information is not recognized (**caller identification, para 0027-0028, 0083, 0090**) and requesting a user to classify the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when the identifying information is not recognized and if no default response is associated with unclassified incoming communication **classify the attempted calls according to calling party classification, para 0029, 0091-0094, 0154, Fig 1**).

Brown fails to explicitly disclose that the processor is located at a cellular telephone and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized

and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications.

However, Helferich disclosed wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications (**col 7, lines 32-65, col 11, lines 54-67, col 12, lines 1-37, Fig 9**)

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of including wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications as taught by Helferich et al in the system of Brown et al to include the feature wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications.

Both Brown and Helferich fail to positively disclose classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized and determine whether there is a

predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification, wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication and allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication.

Mizikovsky disclosed a method for classifying the attempted incoming communication connection using the identifying information with default responses (**item 310 of Fig 3, item 108 of Fig 2, col 4, lines 22-64, function category, response categories set by the user, col 6, lines 44-67**) and classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized (**col 7, lines 50-62, Fig 1**) and determine whether there is a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification (**col 7, lines 63-67**), wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication (**col 7, lines 32-38**) and allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response

to the-attempted incoming communication connection (**col 7, lines 39-67**) or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication (**col 8, lines 14-19, Fig 5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of whether to classify or not to classify the incoming connection based on the identifying information in the connection request as taught by Mizikovsky et al in the system of Brown et al as modified by Helferich et al to include the features of whether to classify or use default classification if exists based on the identifying information or classify according to user's classification if a default classification does not exist and to provide a predetermined response to the attempted incoming connection request. One is motivated as such in order to provide a predetermined response to improve the call handling ability based on the classification and identification of the incoming call at a cellular telephone.

Regarding claims 21,35, Brown et al disclosed a non-transitory computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon processor-executable instructions configured to cause a processor of a cellular telephone (**items 502, 504 of Fig 5, para 0152**) to perform operations comprising:

receiving an attempted incoming communication connection from another device across a wireless network (**Fig 1**);



determining whether the attempted incoming communication can be classified based on whether identifying information of the attempted incoming communication connection is recognized (**para 0017-0018**);

determine whether the attempted incoming communication can be classified based on whether identifying information of the attempted incoming communication connection is recognized (**item 524 of Fig 5, para 0091**) and determine whether there is a default response associated with exists when it is determined that the unclassified incoming communications when identifying information is not recognized (**caller identification, para 0027-0028, 0083, 0090**) and requesting a user to classify the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when the identifying information is not recognized and if no default response is associated with unclassified incoming communication **classify the attempted calls according to calling party classification, para 0029, 0091-0094, 0154, Fig 1**).

Brown et al, disclosed that PDA, wireless telephone (**cellular telephone**) may comprise call processor (**item 120b of Fig 1, para 0047**) and the classification process in the cellular telephone (**0057-0063**) but fails to explicitly disclose that the processor is located at a cellular telephone and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications.

However, Helferich disclosed a mobile device including the wireless communication interface coupled to a processor, and the memory coupled to the processor module for performing processing tasks (**Fig 1-2**) to provide predetermined responses based on the incoming service request (**col 3, lines 37-48, col 4, lines 55-67, col 5, lines 1-67, col 6, lines 1-7**) and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications (**col 7, lines 32-65, col 11, lines 54-67, col 12, lines 1-37, Fig 9**)

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of including a processor coupled to the memory and the client module for performing processing tasks in the cellular telephone and wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection and perform the default response when it is determined that the identifying information is not recognized and that there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications as taught by Helferich et al in the system of Brown et al to include a processor coupled to a memory and a classifier in the cellular telephone to classify the incoming communication connection.

Both Brown and Helferich fail to positively disclose classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when

the identifying information is recognized and determine whether there is a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification, wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication and allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication.

Mizikovsky disclosed a method for classifying the attempted incoming communication connection using the identifying information with default responses (**item 310 of Fig 3, item 108 of Fig 2, col 4, lines 22-64, function category, response categories set by the user, col 6, lines 44-67**) and classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the identifying information when the identifying information is recognized (**col 7, lines 50-62, Fig 1**) and determine whether there is a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification (**col 7, lines 63-67**), wherein the predetermined response establishes whether the attempted incoming communication will be able to establish a connection connect with the user; and perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication (**col 7, lines 32-38**) and allow connection of the incoming

communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the-attempted incoming communication connection (**col 7, lines 39-67**) or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify the incoming communication (**col 8, lines 14-19, Fig 5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of whether to classify or not to classify the incoming connection based on the identifying information in the connection request as taught by Mizikovsky et al in the system of Brown et al as modified by Helferich et al to include the features of whether to classify or use default classification if exists based on the identifying information or classify according to user's classification if a default classification does not exist and to provide a predetermined response to the attempted incoming connection request. One is motivated as such in order to provide a predetermined response to improve the call handling ability based on the classification and identification of the incoming call at a cellular telephone.

Regarding claim 31, Brown et al disclosed the cellular telephone wherein the default response is an audio message configured for unidentified calling parties (**default to voice mail system, para 0094**).

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's argument, see remarks filed on 07/12/2011 with respect to claims 1-35 have been fully considered.

With respect to applicant's argument for claims 1-35 that references fail to teach the features of "determining whether there is a default response associated with unclassified incoming communications when the identifying information is not recognized, wherein the default response establishes whether the unclassified communication will be able to establish a connection" and "a processor configured to request a user to input a classification for the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when the identifying information is not recognized and no default response is associated with unclassified incoming communications", however the examiner respectfully disagree as Brown disclosed the features wherein the processor is configured to: receive an attempted incoming communication connection (para 0033-0037, Fig 1); determine whether the attempted incoming communication can be classified based on whether identifying information of the attempted incoming communication connection is recognized (item 524 of Fig 5, para 0091) and determine whether there is a default response associated with exists when it is determined that the unclassified incoming communications when identifying information is not recognized (caller identification, para 0027-0028, 0083, 0090) and request a user to input a classification for the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when the identifying information is

not recognized and it is determined that no default response is associated with unclassified incoming communications exists (classify the attempted calls according to calling party classification, para 0029, 0091-0094) and therefore obviousness can be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Though not used in the rejections the examiner respectfully suggests applicants to refer to Castell reference (US Pub: 2002/0098831) for the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in the instant application.

### ***Conclusion***

**6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2476 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VENKATESH HALIYUR whose telephone number is (571)272-8616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 11:00AM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Venkatesh Haliyur/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2476

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2476